UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/814,944	03/30/2004	Jonathan J. Hull	20412-08454	8290

758   7590   07/05/2007

FENWICK & WEST LLP
SILICON VALLEY CENTER
801 CALIFORNIA STREET
MOUNTAIN VIEW, CA 94041

EXAMINER
TRAN, MYLINH T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2179	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/05/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/814,944	HULL ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Mylinh Tran	2179	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>30 March 2004</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-48</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-48</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>30 March 2007</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35

U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this

Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 3-6, 11, 13-28, 37-43 and 45 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Blanco [US. 2005/0064935].

As to claims 1 and 27, Blanco teaches a user interface for permitting a user to

control the media content analysis and media representation generation (page

1, 0007); and a media analysis software module for analyzing features of the

media content (page 4, 0053), the media analysis software module being

communicatively coupled to the user interface to receive media content analysis

instructions (page 4, 0058).

As to claim 3, Blanco teaches processing logic for controlling display of a user

interface (page 1, 0042).

As to claims 4 and 28, Blanco teaches processing logic for controlling the

generation of a media representation (page 1, 0007-0008).

As to claim 5, Blanco also teaches hardware for writing a media representation

in digital format (page 2, 0031).

As to claim 6, Blanco teaches a storage medium for storing media

representations written in digital format (page 2, 0031-0033).

As to claims 11 and 45, Blanco teaches a data structure for representing

transformation of media content (page 1, 0007-0008).

As to claim 13, Blanco also teaches the user interface further comprising a

selection menu for allowing a user to select feature analysis to be performed on

media content (page 1, 0008).

As to claims 14 and 40, Blanco teaches a field for setting a threshold on

confidence values associated with results of the media content analysis (figure

12).

As to claims 15 and 42, Blanco also teaches at least one field for managing

and modifying display of media information on a media representation (page 1,

0007).

As to claims 16 and 41, Blanco teaches a preview field for previewing active

media frames within selected media content (page 4, 0053).

As to claim 17, Blanco also teaches a preview field for previewing the media

representation being generated (page 4, 0053-0054).

As to claim 18, Blanco teaches one content selection field for selecting

segments of media content from at least one source to be displayed in a media

representation (page 1, 0008-0009).

As to claims 19 and 43, Blanco also teaches a selector that a user can se

along the content selection field in order to select segments to be displayed in a

media representation (page 4, 0060-0061).

As to claim 20, Blanco teaches graphical illustration of media content from which a user can view media content and select segments of media content (page 4, 0060-0061).

As to claim 21, Blanco also teaches an audio waveform timeline displaying audio content (page 5, 0070).

As to claim 22, Blanco teaches a video timeline displaying video frames extracted from video content (page 5, 0070).

As to claim 23, Blanco also teaches a video timeline displaying text extracted from video content (page 2, 0025).

As to claim 24, Blanco teaches a field for displaying the results of media content analysis, the results being displayed as defined segments along a timeline (page 5, 0070).

As to claim 25, Blanco teaches an output device driver module for driving the media content analysis (page 2, 0023) and the media representation generation, the output device driver module being communicatively coupled to the user interface to receive user instructions (page 2, 0023-0024).

As to claim 26, Blanco also teaches an augmented output device for generating a media representation, the augmented output device being communicatively coupled to the media analysis software module to receive transformed media data, the augmented output device being communicatively

coupled to the output device driver module to receive instructions for media

representation generation (page 3, 0036).

As to claim 37, Blanco teaches storing media content on a storage medium

that is accessible to augmented output device (page 4, 0051).

As to claim 38, Blanco teaches "using a user interface to display media content

formatting options to a user" (page 2, 0031-0032).

As to claim 39, Blanco teaches selecting an analysis technique to be applied to

media content, wherein the analysis technique recognizes defined features in

the media content (page 5, 0070-0075).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for

all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented
and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering

patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that

the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any

inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary.

Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the

inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the

time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the

applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior

art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 2, 7-10, 12, 29-36, 44, 46-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

as being unpatentable over Blanco [US. 2005/0064935] in view of Freedman

[US. 2004/0249650].

As to claim 2, Blanco fails to clearly teach content recognition software for

recognizing features in media content. However, Freedman teaches the content

recognition software at page 18, 0087. It would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine the

teaching of the content recognition software with content media analysis of

Blanco. The motivation of the combination would have been for the advantage

of increasing an operation speed in the media representation generation.

As to claims 7 and 48, Blanco fails to clearly teach the media representation

being generated in paper format. However, Freedman teaches feature at

page15, 0064. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at

the time the invention was made, to combine the teaching of the content

recognition software with content media analysis of Blanco. The motivation of

the combination would have been for the advantage of increasing an operation

speed in the media representation generation.

As to claim 8, Blanco fails to clearly teach the paper format including at least one user-selectable identifier allowing a user to access and control media content. However, Freedman teaches feature at page15, 0064. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine the teaching of the content recognition software with content media analysis of Blanco. The motivation of the combination would have been for the advantage of increasing an operation speed in the media representation generation.

As to claim 9, Blanco fails to clearly teach at least one barcode printed on the media representation. Freedman teaches feature at page 15, 0064. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine the teaching of the content recognition software with content media analysis of Blanco. The motivation of the combination would have been for the advantage of increasing an operation speed in the media representation generation.

As to claims 10 and 44, Blanco also teaches at least one play identifier that can be selected to play an associated media content (page 1, 0007).

As to claim 12, Blanco fails to clearly teach a communication monitoring module for monitoring communication between the components of the system, wherein the communication monitoring module forwards requests for information and replies to requests among system components. However, Freedman teaches features at page 3, 0017. It would have been obvious to one

of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine the teaching of Blanco. The motivation of the combination would have been for the advantage of increasing an operation speed in the media representation generation.

As to claims 29 and 32, Blanco fails to clearly teach performing speech recognition on the media data. However, Freedman teaches the feature at page 8, 0045. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine the teaching of Blanco. The motivation of the combination would have been for the advantage of increasing an operation speed in the media representation generation.

As to claim 30, Blanco fails to clearly teach the optical character recognition on the media data. However, Freedman teaches the features at page 15, 0064. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine the teaching of Blanco. The motivation of the combination would have been for the advantage of increasing an operation speed in the media representation generation.

As to claims 31 and 34, Blanco fails to clearly teach analyzing features of media data further comprises performing face recognition on the media data. However, Freedman teaches the features at page 15, 0064. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine the teaching of Blanco. The motivation of the combination would have

been for the advantage of increasing an operation speed in the media

representation generation.

As to claim 33, Blanco fails to clearly teach performing speaker detection on

the media data. However, Freedman teaches the features at page 9, 0048. It

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the

invention was made, to combine the teaching of Blanco. The motivation of the

combination would have been for the advantage of increasing an operation

speed in the media representation generation.

As to claim 35, Blanco fails to clearly teach performing event detection on the

media data. However, Freedman teaches the features at page 6, 0040. It would

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention

was made, to combine the teaching of Blanco. The motivation of the

combination would have been for the advantage of increasing an operation

speed in the media representation generation.

As to claims 36 and 46-47, Blanco fails to clearly teach adding a print function

to a media rendering application for printing a media representation. However,

Freedman teaches the features at page 15, 0064. It would have been obvious

to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine

the teaching of Blanco. The motivation of the combination would have been for

the advantage of increasing an operation speed in the media representation

generation.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications

from the examiner should be directed to Mylinh Tran. The examiner can

normally be reached on Mon - Thu from 7:00AM to 3:00PM at 571-272-4141.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the

examiner's supervisor, Weilun Lo, can be reached at 571-272-4847.

The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or

proceeding is assigned are as follows:

571-273-8300

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from

the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information

for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public

PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through

Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see

http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private

PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197

(toll-free).

Mylinh Tran

Art Unit 2179

WEILUN LO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER